Scott. II-27—40,000—4-1-

(1937) Department

(Medical)

SERIES.

G.O. No. 305

DATED 12-2-1937

[Despatch Abstract.]

1,002—27-11-35.

ASST. SECRETARY TO GOVT. PUBLIC WORKS DEPT. A 315 1 - FEB 1937

*Received*_____193-

*Registered*_____193

Subject.

M.Y."Stella Polaris" - World cruise 1937 - Call at Mangalore in March 1937 - Levy of Port Dues.

ENCLOSURES.
No._____
Spare copies_____

No. 2147/Est. *Madras, dated* 3rd February 1937

From (Name) Captain B. Gordon, R.I.N.

Presidency Port Officer, Madras,

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,

PUBLIC WORKS (MARINE) **Department.**

Sir,

I have the honor to state that M.Y."Stella Polaris" under Norwegian Colours on a world cruise, is expected to arrive at the port of Mangalore at about 8 A.M. on the 31st March 1937 and leave that port at 5-30 P.M. the same day. The Steamer Agents, Messrs. Harrison & Crossfield Limited, Calicut, state that they expect to have a membership of approximately 100/125 passengers on board on arrival at Mangalore, less an estimated number of 8 passengers on an optional trip who will leave the ship at Colombo and rejoin her at the former port, and wish to know if the vessel will be exempt from payment of Port Dues, as she will not disembark or embark at Mangalore passengers other than those

travelling

travelling on the world cruise including the 8 passengers who will rejoin her there.

2. The above vessel on its world cruise in 1936 called at Quilon and Trivandrum in March 1936 and landed a party of passengers at Quilon who motored to and rejoined the ship at Cochin; she sailed from that port within 48 hours of her arrival. The Port Officer, Cochin, states that no Port Dues were levied on her at the latter port under Section 48(c) of the Indian Ports Act, 1908. It is learnt from the Deputy Port Conservator, Madras, that full Port dues are levied in similar cases at his port. A

3. Though this vessel is on a pleasure cruise, she is plying for hire and she should, I consider, be classified as a passenger vessel for purposes of assessment of Port Dues. As her stay at Mangalore will not exceed 48 hours and as she will not take in any new passengers and earn freight thereby at that port, but only take in some passengers left behind at Colombo, she may, it seems, be exempt from payment of Port Dues under Section 48(c) of the Indian Ports Act, 1908. As the procedure obtaining at Madras and Cochin is not uniform, I request that Government may be pleased to give a ruling in the matter.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

3/2

Captain, R.I.N.,
Presidency Port Officer.

~~[illegible] No. [illegible] of 1937 from the P.W.D. (Marine)~~

Re Port dues levied on M.V. Stella Polaris
on pleasure Cruise calling at Mangalore

Ref. from the P.P.O. No. 2147/Est. dt. 3-2-37

Please see the letter from the P.P.O. in this
C.S. Section 4 (c) of the Indian Ports Act
1908 lays down -

that no port dues shall be chargeable
in respect of any vessel which having entered
any port within the territories administered
by the Governor of Fort St George in
Council leaves within forty eight hours
without discharging or taking in any
passengers or cargo.

The question now for consideration is whether
this section is applicable to M Stella
Polaris ~~who came~~ calling at Mangalore
and leaving the Port within 48 hours
after picking up a few passengers left
by the vessel at Colombo The P.P.O.
reports that he learns from the Deputy
Port Conservator that port dues are levied
in similar cases at ~~that port~~ the Port
of Madras

Submit that the procedure adopted at Madras
is correct and that if any passengers are
taken at the port of call the exemption

Contemplated in 4 8(c) of the Indian Port Act, 1908 cannot be held applicable in such cases. The P.P.O. may be informed accordingly

A draft order is submitted for approval.

Sections 5-47 nor 5 48 (1) (a).

Act allows for the contingency such as reported.

The boat would be making first of the port to pick up the passengers who had landed at Colombo to travel overland. I think port dues would have to be charged in this case

v.
10/2/37

I presume the Landing Chief acting with the Port Officer is authorised to issue landing orders